


REMARKS

Applicants traverse the species election requirement. Applicants hereby elect the species of Fig. 1. Claims readable on Species I are 21-29, 32-40, and 42.

Applicants traverse the requirement because independent claims 21 and 32 are generic to both Figures 1 and 2 and if these claims are found allowable, then all claims in the case must be allowed. Note, for example, that as to independent claim 21 reciting that the server system has at least a first server, that dependent claim 29 recites that there are at least first and second servers whereas dependent claim 30 recites that both the supplying computer program module and the reading computer program modules are run on the first server. Thus claim 21 covers Figures 1, 2, and 3 generically. System claim 32 is similarly generic to Figs. 1, 2, and 3 where dependent claim 40 recites that there is a first server and a second server and dependent claim 41 recites that both the supplying computer program module and the reading computer program module run on the first server.

It is noted that original independent claim 1 was similarly generic to Figures 1, 2, and 3 and therefore the Examiner's statement at page 2, last line, that no claims are currently generic was not correct.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett A. Valiquet (Reg.No. 27,841)
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574